

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/062,599	02/05/2002	Steven M. Ruben	PZ006G13YP1C1D1	9690	
22195 7.	590 03/24/2004		EXAM	INER	
	NOME SCIENCES INC		CARLSON,	CARLSON, KAREN C	
	AL PROPERTY DEPT. GROVE ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ROCKVILLE,	MD 20850		1653		

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/062,599	RUBEN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D.	1653			
The MAILING DATE of this communication of Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron tute, cause the application to become ABANDONI	imely filed lys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
,	his action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the practice under the practice.	·				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the applicati	on.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	lrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	i)-(d) or (f).			
<u></u>	a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
,					
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		ion No.			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	, ,				
application from the International Bure		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ed.			
	,				
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	 			
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	08) 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)			
·	-/ <u>-</u>				

Application/Control Number: 10/062,599

Art Unit: 1653

Claims 1-52 are currently pending and are under examination.

Object to Spec: The priority data at page 1 needs to be updated to reflect that SN 09/690,454 is now U.S. Patent 6,531,447.

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894); In re Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-3 and 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-3 and 5-12 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,531,447. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 4 and 13-52 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 13-52 of U.S. Patent No. 6,531,447. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Instant Claim 4 states that the protein comprising amino acids 30-113 of SEQ ID NO: 59 further comprises a heterologous polypeptide sequence while USP Claim 4 states that the

Application/Control Number: 10/062,599

Art Unit: 1653

protein comprising all of SEQ ID NO: 59 further comprises a heterologous polypeptide sequence. Thus, the USP Claim 4 encompasses the instant Claim 4.

Claims 13-52 are identical to USP Claims 13-52 except that the functional language "promotes vascularization" has been added to the USP claims.

It is expected that once the written description rejection set forth below is overcome by amendment, most likely by adding the same functional language as found in the USP, Claims 13-52 will be subject to statutory double patenting rejections over the USP.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification fails to describe polypeptides having 90% or 95% identity to SEQ ID NO: 59, or specified fragments thereof to include 30 or 50 contiguous amino acids of SEQ ID NO: 59, that are functional. Thus, without written description, one cannot know when a polypeptide having 90% identity, for example, to SEQ ID NO: 59 is a polypeptide described in the specification and claimed. This rejection can be overcome by adding functional language to the claims, so that one can correlate structure and function to determine if that polypeptide is taught in the specification and encompassed by the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1653

No Claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0946. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM, off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Christopher Low can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER

Har Ce hane Carlin (Da)